The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2021

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/20/3262768
5 Holmemead, Whitlingham Lane, Kirby Bedon, Norwich NR14 8UA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Davey against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
- The application Ref 2020/1514, dated 19 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
- The development proposed is detached workshop, office and bedroom annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether this proposal would be acceptable, with regard to development plan policy for the provision of residential annexe accommodation.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is within one of two terraces of houses situated within rather remote countryside. The dwellings have long back gardens, with an unmade access to the rear. Following an earlier planning consent for the same, this proposal seeks a re-siting away from the main house to along the rear access, where neighbouring dwellings have their garages and ancillary buildings located.

4. The building proposed would comprise a ground floor workshop with separate garden room and an upstairs bedroom, shower and home office within the roof space. Located at the end of the back garden to No 5, the detached building would reflect the location of similar such ancillary development serving other properties in this residential enclave. The neighbouring property has a double garage of a lower height but similar form to this proposal that is immediately adjacent.

5. Where a separate dwelling might either not be feasible or supported under planning policy, the South Norfolk Local Plan (LP) provides for the possibility of annexe accommodation being allowed to meet specific household or family requirements. This is addressed by LP Policy DM 3.7. The supporting text that precedes this policy provides interpretation over how it is to be applied. It explains how residential annexes should be designed flexibly to meet accommodation needs, with the potential to be reabsorbed back into the main dwelling when no longer required. On this basis, an unduly large or detached annex might prove a future liability should a property change hands, with the

possible pressure for severance and use as separate and potentially substandard accommodation.

6. The Council had been satisfied with the same development, only closer to the host dwelling. Although not linked physically, as allowed the annexe would have had a close spatial relationship with the host dwelling. Whilst the currently proposed siting, significantly further removed from No 5, would better reflect the prevailing arrangement of neighbouring ancillary structures, this would be a position susceptible to future use as independent occupation. The building proposed would be of a sufficient size to provide a small dwelling, with space to its side to preserve separate rear access to the existing house.

7. The proposal would conflict with LP Policy DM 3.7, which resists residential annexes unless designed so as to continue to be used as part of the main dwelling, without creating an independent residential unit in the future. This would not otherwise be a suitable location for a separate dwelling as it would appear both incongruous and necessitate high dependence on private car use to access the nearest essential services. The needs for home office or spare bedroom accommodation could equally be met within a building provided through permitted development rights. For the reasons given, I conclude this proposal would be unacceptable with regard to development plan policy for the provision of residential annexe accommodation.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, having taken into consideration all further matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

Inspector